

**Workgroup 2, Fire Code Edits**  
**Virginia Housing Center**  
**July 19, 2017**  
**Summary Notes**

Richard Potts welcomed everyone and all attendees introduce themselves.

We started by revisiting the proposals that were being worked on for this meeting.

**M609.1 Andrew Milliken and Rick Witt are still working on this proposal.**

Robby Dawson stated that M609.2 is a separate code change and for the rewrite issue it gets stricken as long as the Mobile Food Preparation code change goes through.

Vernon Hodge said we will note as non-consensus and then staff will have responsibility of correlating whatever comes out of the separate proposal.

Andrew Milliken stated the concern with the Mobile Food Preparation change was we couldn't cite locations that were not utilizing the appropriate ventilation and that the Final Phase proposal addresses Type 1 hoods in places that have Type 1 hoods, not places that currently do not have them. Andrew put some language together but Rick had some concerns and we are not sure whether there is going to be consensus. The language he was trying to craft together simply said removing the Type 1 hood reference and addressing cooking operations and making sure that it is operating with the ventilation system in accordance with the applicable building code.

Rick Witt said he could go with what is in the rewrite code but would like to incorporate the mobile food kitchen hood language. He would like it to be a new and improved section.

**Vernon Hodge said we can leave this open to bring back again at the last meeting.**

**R-803 carry over for Rick Witt's changes.**

**R-804 carry over for Rick Witt's changes.**

**901.5 Installation acceptance testing**  
**Consensus FSB language, have counsel review**

**901.5.1 Occupancy**

Robby Dawson stated this gives the fire official the ability to evacuate people from the building.

Rick Witt said that the building official can delegate to the fire official in their locality.

Linda Hale disagrees with this delegated authority. She believes that this allows the fire official to be able to act on behalf of public safety. There should be checks and balances.

Kenney Payne asked if the FSB language precludes other options like fire watch so these systems aren't operational. Does it not give you this option? Could there be other options or does it take that away?

Andrew Milliken stated you always have the option for code modifications and resolutions to the problem. What is happening here, is we are deleting the ability to even indicate there is a problem. You can cite to say it is unlawful under the code but this does not take this off the table.

Linda Hale stated we need to include the language as authorized by the building official for checks and balances. If it doesn't, it should empower the fire official to take action on behalf of public safety.

Rick Witt stated sometimes it conflicts between the building official and the fire official. He sees this as someone trying to get the authority because they can't get along in their own locality.

Robby Dawson asked Rick Witt about his statement. As long as that building is under construction, the fire official has neither responsibility nor authority. Yes, or No? Rick Witt stated that is correct. How do you, the building official require fire protection and water supply for the building being constructed? How do you prohibit smoking in the construction area or how do you regulate hot water permits that are required under the fire code that some localities do.

Vernon Hodge stated the differentiation between construction code and fire code. Section 27-34.4 outlines the inspection and review of plans of buildings under construction.

Sean Farrell asked how is the fire marshal's action of terminating occupancy of a building being unsafe, how is it affecting the manner of construction?

Andrew Milliken said it is not citing the USBC. This is the whole reason we are here.

Vernon Hodge said if there is consensus to have provisions it has to be run through our counsel.

Robby Dawson stated he doesn't agree with this, to evacuate the building because the system is not in-place or in-service and working as it is supposed to.

Shawn Pharr stated the responsibility doesn't pass until completion of the structure.

Linda Hale said we are not enforcing the USBC at all.

Robby Dawson asked again, how does the building official regulate water supply, no smoking and hot water permits?

Vernon Hodge stated a water supply has to be available to make the building safe.

Shawn Pharr stated again it doesn't pass to the local fire marshal until completion of the structure.

Andrew Milliken stated the water supply question is excellent. It talks about sprinklers, standpipes and it doesn't say you have to have water on site when you have combustible materials.

Vernon Hodge said counsel will have to look at this and decide.

Chris Anderson stated where localities have adopted a local ordinance that states the fire official shall enforce the SFPC through inspections and plan review. The locality can do that because, under Dillon's law, it supersedes the state law. We cannot be less restrictive but we can be more restrictive. By taking this out, how does this affect this?

## **Non-Consensus**

### **Section 905 Standpipe Systems**

#### **905.1 General**

Robby Dawson stated the FSB edit is more acceptable, clean and neat.

Kenney Payne asked what the applicable referenced standards were. Current or at the time they were constructed?

Andrew Milliken stated there is a specific section #901. The maintenance standards do not follow the code under which it was constructed, it is for the most recent standards.

Robby Dawson stated this is clear in the maintenance standards.

Rick Witt and Sean Farrell are good with this.

## **Consensus**

### **905.2 Maintenance standard**

Linda Hale said it should be maintained in accordance with NFPA14. This is an installation standard.

Kenney Payne asked how often fire departments change connections?

Linda Hale stated they had cabinets full of reducers and connections.

## **Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3 through 905.3.4 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3.4.1 Hose and cabinet**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3.5 Underground buildings (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3.6 Helistops and heliports (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3.7 Marinas and boatyards**

Robby Dawson said Chapter 36 will address the issue of access. You take the installation requirements out of Chapter 36, and he thinks they have touched on some of those. There are some inspection, testing and maintenance requirements for marinas and boatyards that are different from buildings. Striking it now means that you have to apply the building inspection, testing and maintenance requirements.

Kenney Payne asked if this complies with Chapter 36, suppose we don't get to Chapter 36. What will we be moving forward?

Andrew Milliken stated you go under the assumption that there is nothing construction related in this chapter.

Robby Dawson said he had some heartburn with that. We have seen the difference of opinion in enforceable vs. non-enforceable and construction vs. non-construction. He wanted to speak on his position as a board member, he might have a problem with staff deleting stuff in Chapter 36 and calling it editorial correlation; him speaking as a fire official saying he can enforce that as an enforceable requirement.

Vernon Hodge stated the board will approve whatever they approve. The staff will take direction from the board.

Bill Aceto stated he just did a quick look at Chapter 36 and it is mostly maintenance and operational.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.3.8 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.4**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.4.1 through 905.5.2 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.5.3 Class II system 1-inch hose**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.6 through 905.6.2 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.7 Cabinets**  
**Consensus FSB edit**  
**Include subsections**

**905.8 Dry standpipes (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.9 Valve supervision (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.10 During construction**

Robby Dawson stated this will be non-consensus because of under construction. This deals with the maintenance of accessibility of maintaining water supply lines, etc.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**905.11 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**906.1 Where required**  
**In its entirety it is a state amendment**  
**Consensus Proposed Phase**

**906.2.1 Certification of service personnel for portable fire extinguishers.**

Robby Dawson suggested deleting governmental agency. He stated there is no true governmental agency responsible for certifications for fire extinguishers.

Linda Hale asked how this was construction related?

Andrew Milliken stated there is no current licensure for fire extinguisher service personnel.

Shawn Pharr stated if you need to recharge a portable fire extinguisher in your house anymore, you need to be trained?

Sean Farrell asked about authorizing third party inspections.

Robby Dawson asked who presents this to the Attorney General's office.  
Who presents a counter argument?

**Consensus FSB edit**

## **Fire Alarm and Detection Systems**

### **907.1 General**

Rick Witt asked if this was an existing state amendment. Thinks it may need work on, take out performance. It should not apply to new buildings. 907.9 deals with retrofitting.

**Consensus FSB edit (existing state amendment needs work) strike last two sentences.**

#### **907.1.1 Documents**

Robby Dawson suggested striking in accordance with Section 901.2.

**Non-consensus**

#### **907.1.2 stricken**

**Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.1.3 Equipment**

**Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.2 stricken to 907.2.6.3.2**

**Consensus FSB edit**

##### **907.2.6.3.2.1**

**Consensus FSB edit**

##### **907.2.6.3.3 through 907.2.10.3 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.2.11 Single and multiple-station smoke alarms**

Robby Dawson stated that for alarms not required by the building code they shall be listed. This is strictly dealing with single and multiple station smoke alarms.

Kris Bridges asked if there were any out there today for sale outside of the parameters of NFPA-72.

Kenney Payne asked what is the difference between required and regulated.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.2.11.1 through 907.2.11.7 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.2.12 Alarm**

We have to address the subsection

Proponent, Robby Dawson will make the changes and re-submit

**907.3 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.3.1 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.3.2 Delayed egress locks**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.3.3 Elevator emergency operation**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.3.4 through 907.4.1 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.2 Manual fire alarm boxes**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.2.1 Location (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.2.2 Height (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.2.3 Color**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.2.5 Protective Covers**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.4.3 through 907.5 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.5.1 Presignal feature**

Robby Dawson stated typically they will get the signal at the switchboard or they get the alarm company to call them as a pre-signal procedure before they notify the fire

department. Some jurisdictions want this and some don't. This piece of it is an operational issue. If you are a proprietary system such as a guard shack as in accordance with the building code, the first step procedurally that some departments want is that first call 9-1-1 to get the fire trucks coming then they will investigate. This is a procedural issue.

Kenney Payne asked if this appears in the building code? As a designer I'm going by the building code, the building official will approve this, it gets installed and then is turned over to fire services, and they say they don't like how it works.

Robby Dawson gave an example; a DuPont or large commercial company decides they don't want the fire brigade but they still want to utilize the presignal but the fire is going to have a far more headstart on them and he is now no longer approving that presignal feature because they changed their operation and that changes his approval of it.

Andrew Milliken stated that nothing is construction here; it just says this function cannot be utilized.

Shawn Pharr said we still want this permanently approved.

#### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.5.2 (stricken) Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.5.2.1 (stricken) Consensus FSB edit**

#### **907.5.2.1.1 Sound pressure**

Andrew Milliken stated it is an operational issue.

Kenney Payne said the sound alarm notification appliance shall maintain the sound within the occupied space.

Rick Witt asked if it should have a period after the building code. It has to be maintained.

Robby Dawson stated if you test the sound pressure horn strobe in all the rooms and if it meets the requirements in all the occupied space in accordance with the building code then you are good.

Shawn Pharr said this is redundant.

#### **Non consensus**

**907.5.2.1.2 through 907.5.2.2.3 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

Linda Hale wanted to point something out; a lot of the things in the DHCD original version added maintenance language in very generic portions and what the Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee did was to take these portions out since they were stricken, we added these back in through specific areas where it is needed. DHCD added the generic and struck it in the specific areas. We did the exact opposite of that. She is not comfortable with Fire Services striking it and then we argue about the specifics and then it goes to non-consensus status. She feels this is double jeopardy.

Robby Dawson said lets back up and see what happens with that specific section next. We have the SFPC un-stricken, the DHCD version strikes the whole thing and we have the Fire Services Board changes. What happens to 907.5.2.1.1 next?

Richard Potts stated that any section that is non-consensus will be pulled out from the bunch and will be reviewed, line by line, by the board.

Robby Dawson stated so they have 3 versions to look at.

Vernon Hodge stated they will have the 2 drafts and the IFC version. If you have issues, anyone can submit a public comment in cdpVA so they are aware of your issue.

**907.5.2.2.4 Emergency voice/alarm communication captions.**

Vernon Hodge stated it is contingent upon the definition and the definition refers back to the code in which it was built under.

Robby Dawson stated this was the objective.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.5.2.2.5 Emergency power**

Sean Farrell said he believes this could be a slippery slope and he has stated this many times.

Cindy Davis asked for a clarification of the language. If the board comes back with the building code opposed to applicable building code, are you still ok with this?

Robby Dawson stated just as long as the definition of building code means what either the Fire Services Board edit committee suggested or to something of that intent. Meaning that it is the building code under which it was constructed.

Sean Farrell stated he doesn't know whether this answered Cindy's question. Cindy Davis stated it didn't.

Cindy Davis stated the way it is worded it implies that it has to be in accordance with the building code.

Andrew Milliken said no, it says it shall be maintained, if it is provided in accordance with the building code.

Kenney Payne stated as a designer, he would interpret this as zero or silent, it doesn't say anything.

Robby Dawson asked if there were any building code requirements that did not require some timeframe.

Rick Witt asked why we couldn't take the last sentence out.

Sean Farrell stated maintain in accordance with the building code.

Shawn Pharr said you need to check with the building code.

Andrew Milliken said it depends on the discrepancy we are dealing with. If there is a discrepancy you will have to research the code for your final determination.

Sean Farrell stated they have the same thing going on with the Property Maintenance where they have to look up different issues.

Rick Witt stated he doesn't go along with the descriptive timeframe.

**Non Consensus**

**907.5.2.3 -907.6.2 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.6.3 Initiating device identification**

Kenney Payne asked if it was Robby Dawson's intent that it would go into the appendix if it was stricken.

Robby Dawson stated no, if it is stricken, it is stricken.

**Consensus FSB edit (grammatical change)**

**907.6.3.1 – 907.6.4.2 (stricken)**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**907.6.5 Access**

**Consensus FSB edit (possible wording change)**

**907.6.6 Monitoring**  
Consensus FSB edit

**907.6.6.1 Automatic telephone-dialing devices**  
Consensus FSB edit

**907.6.6.2 Termination of monitoring service**  
Consensus FSB edit

**907.7-907.7.2 (stricken)**  
Consensus FSB edit

**907.7.3 Instructions**  
Consensus FSB edit

**907.8-907.9 (state amendments)**

**908.1 Group H. occupancies**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.2 Group H-5 occupancy**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.3 Highly toxic and toxic materials**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.4 Ozone gas-generator rooms.**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.5 Repair garages**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.6 Refrigeration systems**  
Consensus FSB edit

**908.7 Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) systems**  
Consensus FSB edit

**909.1 Scope and purpose**  
Consensus FSB edit

**909.2-909.4.5 (stricken)**  
Consensus FSB edit

**909.4.6 Duration of operation**  
Consensus FSB edit

**909.4.7 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.5 Smoke barriers**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.5.1-909.5.2 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.5.3 Opening protection**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.5.3.1(stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.5.3.2**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.6-909.10.4 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.10.5 Fans**

**Robby Dawson stated it is operational.**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.11 Standby power**

Andrew Milliken stated the applicable building code will not have the language. You wouldn't have to do any routine maintenance on this standby power. Section 604 has the requirement needed.

Robby Dawson stated emergency power systems shall be maintained in accordance with this section (604). Existing installation shall be maintained in accordance with the original approval. Standby power systems shall be maintained in accordance with NFPA 70, 110 and 111.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.11.1 Equipment Room**

**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.11.2 - 909.13.3 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.14 Marking and identification**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.15 Control diagrams**

Kenney Payne said this is not unlike record documents, control diagrams is a document that must be prepared. The question is who prepares it, the non-professional or the sub that is providing the controls? Someone has to draw it up and someone has to pay the person to draw it.

Robby Dawson stated it is different than the others. This has a significant operational impact.

Andrew Milliken said this system might as well not be there if we don't know how to operate it. You need the control diagram to operate that piece of equipment during an emergency. If you don't have that function, you can't operate that component.

Rick Witt said the way it is worded "it shall be maintained".

Robby Dawson stated you have a system and you have a drawing, you have to maintain a current "as-built". If it is a problem then this would be a separate code change.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.16 – 909.16.1 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.16.2 Smoke control panel**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.16.3 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.17 System response time**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.18- 909.18.8.3 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.18.8.3.1 Report filing**

Kenney Payne asked who provides a copy.

Robby Dawson stated you would be in violation if you did not provide the certification of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party to the fire official.

Andrew Milliken stated ultimately this is a building owner responsibility. They are going to get it from the 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

Rick Witt stated the owner is going to have to pay the engineer to provide the certification.

## **Consensus FSB edit**

### **909.18.9 Identification and documentation**

Cindy Davis stated if in the proposed phase the section is stricken, we have kept it as a reference point and placed in the appendix. When the FSB edit is totally stricken, fire services does not provide that language in the appendix? Are we not going to provide that language in the appendix? What do you all want to do?

Vernon Hodge said he thought the consensus stated the appendix was not needed.

Rick Witt stated he thought the board would have to make that decision. It will be another discussion whether it has an appendix or not.

Robby Dawson said the proposed phase eliminated a ton of reference material that was used. The FSB version keeps that reference and tweaks it to the point where it is enforceable.

Sean Farrell stated his understanding that this was a request from some members of the fire services to keep the language so that there would be some reference for when they were in the field to have some guidelines. He has heard unanimously since then, fire services does not want the appendix in the back since it is no longer needed. If it was at the request of the fire services then fire services needs to provide a different direction subsequent to that. He said, like Vernon Hodge, they heard testimony from the majority of the fire services that the request is no longer needed or wanted.

Robby Dawson said the first statement regarding the appendix request from fire services was inaccurate. We were taking all this stuff out but we used that to gauge how we applied the code. Someone came up with just moving it to the appendix and it is still there. That raises more problems that we won't get into. Now instead of deleting, we are keeping it with some reference and it gives some enforceability substance. He thinks adding the appendix creates a number of other questions, that we don't need to get into.

Cindy Davis stated that still did not answer her question, do you want an appendix or not? Cindy said she doesn't want to take to the board without a decision from this body. Do you want it taken to the board with or without an appendix?

Vernon Hodge stated we will have to see what gets approved and what doesn't.

Robby Dawson stated that we don't know what it is going to look like. Our proposal is different now with the edits. If this one goes through then maybe the appendix would be lesser of the three evils. If FSB edits we don't need it or want it.

Cindy Davis stated that maybe we need to give them two separate proposals. Her thoughts were we would incorporate what was consensus into the code version. If the hybrid isn't going to work maybe we will just leave in the two separate proposals.

Kenney Payne stated in his observation, we will not be getting through all the fire service board edits. What will the board do with the chapters we do not get through?

Vernon Hodge stated again it is up to the board of housing.

Chris Anderson stated it is too early to tell whether we need an appendix. Can we hold off until the last meeting to decide, would that be reasonable.

Shaun Pharr stated his recollection was to have one book to help the code official and the fire official take into the field.

Cindy Davis said that staff needs some direction how to prepare the package for the board.

Robby Dawson stated that our objective was not a fire services request; it was a solution that came out of somewhere else.

Rick Witt stated that your former president suggested in Region 7 that is where this came from.

Linda Hale stated you need benchmarks to know what was approved. This is what we were trying to do.

Andrew Milliken said we aren't at a position that we even know what we are dealing with. One, you have a hybrid version of all consensus changes which doesn't need an appendix because it was consensus. Two, the FSB edit which doesn't need an appendix. Three, a DHCD version which needs an appendix. Four, you could do nothing.

#### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **909.19 (stricken)**

#### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **909.20.1 Schedule (add additional language for a separate code change)**

#### **Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21 Elevator hoist way pressurization alternative**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.1-909.21.2 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.3 Ducts for system**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.4 Fan system**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.4.1 Fire resistance**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.4.2-909.21.4.4 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.5 Standby power**

Robby Dawson said we weren't sure about what Section 604 was going to be. He was ok with Section 604.

**Consensus FSB edit (DHCD staff to correlate if Section 604 is deleted)**

**909.21.6-909.21.7 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.8 Marking and identification**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.9 Control diagrams**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.10 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**909.21.11 System response time**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**910.1 General**

Kenney Payne suggested moving the words around.  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**910.2 – 910.3.3 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**910.4 Mechanical smoke removal systems**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**910.4.1 – 910.4.7 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**911.1 General**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**911.2 through 912.2.1 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**912.6 Backflow protection**

Shaun Pharr suggested re-wording “Where required potable water supply to automatic sprinklers is protected against backflow as required by the building code, the means of protection shall be maintained in accordance with NFPA 25.”

Andrew Milliken said in the model code you have to provide a device. It says you shall put in a backflow preventer. We do want to emphasize the backflow preventer needs to be maintained in accordance with NFPA 25.

Kenney Payne suggested moving on with Shaun Pharr’s language.

**Consensus FSB edit (change per Shaun Pharr’s language) Robby Dawson to change.**

**913.1 General**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**913.2 Protection against interruption of service.**

Andrew Milliken and Linda Hale suggested replacing protection with maintain. They tried to remove the construction components in the subsequent sections.

Kenney Payne said he didn’t think that would work. Is there something in NFPA 20 that speaks about protection?

Rick Witt stated you are already doing that. The initial installation will address things like fire, not earthquakes in this area, freezing, etc.

Linda Hale stated NFPA20 also suggests to NFPA25 for the inspection, testing and maintenance.

**Non-consensus**

**913.2.1 Protection of fire pump rooms (check Chapter 7 for retrofit)**  
**Consensus for FSB edit**

**913.2.2 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**913.3 Temperature of pump room**

Kenney Payne asked what if the 1980 BOCA said above 45 degrees.

Andrew Milliken said you would be fine. If it is freezing, the pump will be out of service and not doing what it was intended to do. 40 comes from NFPA13. It says the safety factor put in all buildings everywhere for how warm it needs to be, so you know this system will operate as it should.

Kenney Payne asked what is the issue, is it the temperature or that it is operating properly.

Andrew Milliken stated if it is 40 or below it is not operating properly.

**Consensus FSB edit**

**913.4 Valve supervision**

Rick Witt stated that both edits need work.

Maintain the valve operations

**Non-consensus**

**913.4.1 Test outlet valve supervision**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**913.5.1(stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**914.1 -914.2.3 9 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**914.2.4 Fire department access to equipment**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

**914.3-914.8.5 (stricken)**  
**Consensus FSB edit**

## **914.8.6 Aircraft paint hangar fire suppression**

Kenney Payne asked if there is no fire suppression can you require it?

### **Consensus Proposed Phase**

#### **914.9-914.11.3 (stricken)**

##### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **915.1 General**

Rick Witt stated installation of carbon monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with the building code.

Andrew Milliken said to capture when you are installing carbon monoxide detectors those devices should be installed in accordance with the building code.

Rick Witt asked if we could say “Where provided, installation of carbon monoxide detectors shall be in accordance with the building code”.

Andrew Milliken stated they would not have any problems with that.

### **Consensus with revised language of “Where provided installation of carbon monoxide detectors shall be in accordance with the building code”.**

#### **915.1.1 – 915.5.3 (stricken)**

##### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **915.6 Maintenance**

##### **Consensus FSB edit**

#### **1001.1 General**

Robby Dawson stated that from the FSB perspective, they went through Chapter 10 at their last meeting which lasted 5 hours and they probably haven’t tackled it all yet. They had better philosophy and understanding of how all the pieces fit together. This is literally the first sling of mud against the wall. They started at 1031 and worked backwards.

Andrew Milliken stated they are making a concerted effort to keep the model language. He believes we are all on the same page. We are trying to maintain the format the best we can.

#### **1031.4 Exit signs**

Kenney Payne said he moved for approval of the FSB edit.

Robby Dawson stated lets go to 1020.2 and 1023.9 which we have tweaked.

Richard Potts asked Robby Dawson if he thought the committee would have enough sections fine-tuned by the next meeting on August 16.

Robby Dawson stated we will have meetings, yes, we will fine tune yes, but will we be finished? He thinks they will be in a position to have more done and they want to complete the definitions.

Kenney Payne stated let's be honest, we are not going to get through this book in one more meeting. He asked if FSB would be willing to identify which chapters they think are the most critical to get through at the next meeting? Kenney suggested maybe discussing sections 10, 50, 47, 62.

Robby Dawson said this is his concern, we are re-writing this whole book. He stated if we get through 10 and maybe 50 there are other things in 40 that may reference something that is now vacant and creates a conflict of enforceability. This is his concern about piece-mailing because we are changing so many references and points.

Richard Potts called the end of the meeting.